DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 791 RC 022 582

AUTHOR Fontaine, Carla
TITLE Democracy, Schools and Communities.
PUB DATE 1998-00-00
NOTE 13p.; In: Toward Place and Community; see RC 022 580.
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Centralization; Community Control; Consolidated Schools; *Democracy; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Essays; *Participative Decision Making; Politics of Education; *Public Education; *Rural Schools; *School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Sense of Community

ABSTRACT

Historically, participation in school affairs gave rural people a working knowledge of how democracy functioned. In the late 19th century, power shifted from the voice of the many to the voice of a few, as "expert" opinion increasingly influenced state legislators, governors, and national political leaders. The push to consolidate schools resulted from that thinking. Legislation has undermined the ability of citizens to make decisions at the local level, effectively disenfranchising a populace that had once so spiritedly engaged in local government, education, and community. As rural communities lost their core with the consolidation of their schools, their economic viability also dwindled, resulting in a loss of employment-seeking youth and community identity. Today, citizens are making efforts to exert more local control, as evidenced by the charter school movement and efforts to resist further consolidation of consolidated schools. In a recent Gallup Poll, most respondents wanted public schools to prepare students to be responsible citizens; favored community service as a requirement for graduation from high school; and saw local teachers, not nonlocal leaders such as state legislators, as most committed to local public school improvement. It is possible that local schools and rural communities will thrive once again as concerned citizens exert more influence in the democratic process. (TD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 444 791

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Carla Fontaine
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DEMOCRACY, SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

Carla Fontaine

To close a country school was to destroy an institution that held the little rural community together. It was to wipe out the one building the people of the district had in common and, in fact, to destroy the community, which, in those years, so many were trying to save and strengthen. Even more important...the destruction of their school meant that their power...would be taken from them and given to some board far removed from their community and their control.[1]

One of the great educational debates of the last decades of the nineteenth century revolved around matters of school organization and governance. While centralization of schools ultimately won out, it is clear that centralization wasn't the only option or even the best option. Had democracy been the principal interest, schools would have remained closer to the families being served by schools. It is also possible that rural communities would have developed differently had the belief in centralization of schools and socio-economic structures not been so pervasive.

I will re-introduce in this essay some of the virtues of small schools and communities historically in relation to democracy. My purpose is to re-visit the issue as the Rural Challenge seeks to look back as one means of going forward. In doing so, I acknowledge that I present what may seem an idealized view. The locally controlled, community-based schools of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were not all havens of goodwill or fueled by democratic impulses. African-Americans and Native Americans struggled almost everywhere for a genuine education that was respectful, that was aimed at full participation in the society. And there were periods of uncontrolled nativism that caused enormous distress for those who were different ethnically and religiously. Yet, the language of democracy and hopes for something better remained strong. Even in the worst of times, those larger hopes were present, brought forward as something to work toward. It is the larger vision that I have chosen to address as it is the vision the Rural Challenge most wishes to affirm.

RC022582

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Rhetoric of Centralization

A Michigan educator, speaking to a group of professionals in 1879, embodied some of the centralizing rhetoric of that period, noting:

> *The only way I see to better the condition of the (country) schools is to take just as much of their control out of the hands of the people as is possible. The people do not know the needs of the schools. They have been educated in these poor schools, and until the schools are better the people will be ignorant...Centralization is what we need in school management.*[2]

Such words, expressing the sentiment of vocal 'experts' in the late 19th century, heralded a diminishment of local control of education and the consequent decline of that community voice so vital to direct democracy. The loss of small community schools and the resulting erosion of grass-roots democracy has had serious consequences for a society founded on the premise that schools were the great 'engines' of democracy.

Rural schools historically played a crucial role in localizing interest, fostering democracy, and providing "nerve centers of society"[3] in local communities. In order to better understand how small, seemingly independent schools — the pillars of democracy in our society — responded to the mandates dictating consolidation into more 'efficiently' managed, standardized institutions, one must consider the history of rural schools and communities and the forces exerted by state governments and various centralizing agencies.

Rural Schools as Community Centers and Laboratories of Democracy

"Both literally and symbolically the school and the schoolhouse stood at the center of the community. The school was, in many cases, the community's most expensive and significant creation."[4] In addition to the educational and social purposes schools served, they were symbols of communal identity. "Often the only public building in the neighborhood, [the school] gave the community its identity, so that farmers might say they lived in the Gravel Hill District or the Eureka District..."[5] Over the years such local language has been lost.

Historically, rural schools have been critical community centers. The schoolhouse was a natural gathering place for important debates about local matters. It was within the schools, as community centers, that direct democracy occurred. It was often *about* the school that feelings crystallized into opinions voiced by invested citizens. Schoolhouse walls echoed with the high pitch of emotion as local citizens argued over required textbooks, an increase in teachers' salaries, or — as would have been heard in some schools in Oklahoma — the need to re-sod the walls. In the community school building, tempers flared, as citizens argued together, humor appreciated its most public manifestation, and eventual compromise was reached as citizens participated in the democratic process.[6]

Locally organized public schools provided hands-on experience with the democratic process. Community schools instructed, facilitated and encouraged democratic participation. They were:

invaluable laboratories of democracy in which rural Americans learned the importance of their vote, how to make laws, and how to govern themselves. They wrestled with such intricacies as bond issues, taxes, and contingency funds, and if they had greater confidence in democracy than other groups of Americans, it was because democracy was no abstraction to them. In their school districts they learned that their vote made a difference, that they could change what they did not like, and that democracy actually worked. [7]

Fund-raisers such as pie, box, or corn mush socials brought local citizens together in the school house. Seemingly disparate functions such as religious meetings, community dances, Grange meetings, and card-playing groups were commonplace occurrences within the schoolhouse walls. As social centers, rural schools helped dispel the loneliness so inherent in isolated areas.

Public Schools: "Raking the Geniusses from the Rubbish"

To pursue the ideal of democracy and to prepare citizens to participate in a republic, Thomas Jefferson proposed a universal system of free public schools. As the most prominent and vocal proponent of free public education, Jefferson believed it to be a means by which "the best geniusses [would] be raked from the rubbish."[8] Jefferson saw free public education as instrumental to the preservation of the republic:

...education is the most certain and the most legitimate engine of government. Educate and inform the whole mass of the people, enable them to see that it is in their interest to preserve peace and order, and they will preserve it...They are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty.[9]

Through equal access to education, Jefferson asserted, future leaders would rise on their own merit. Firmly believing in the equalizing impact free public education would have on society, Jefferson proposed a "pyramidal system of education reaching from district elementary schools"[10] to state universities and, ultimately, a national university. He proposed that such a university would strengthen national unity by providing a place for potential leaders from the various regions of the country to come together and realize commonalities and appreciate differences. George Washington, another advocate of a national university, left money in his will for such an institution. However, a "widespread belief that schooling should be a matter of local initiative and control"[11] prevented the implementation of such a plan.

The Land Ordinance of 1785, which was drafted by Thomas Jefferson and enacted by The Articles of Confederation government and consequently adopted into many of the 'Old Northwest' state constitutions, reserved one lot in each 'Northwest' township for public schools. The states that emerged in

the Northwest territory — Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin — subscribed, from their inception, to the philosophy espoused in the Ordinance that "religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged."[12] It was here that schools assumed a particularly rich democratic heritage.

The vital role of education in a democratic process played out differently in the major regions of the country as each responded to the need for free public education. Each region's unique approach can be attributed to its highly individualistic sense of identity.

New England

In New England, where the Puritan commitment to education permeated the settlements, there was an early commitment to common schools. Provisions for schools as very local institutions were established as early as 1642 in Massachusetts Bay Colony. Schools became more common, however, in the early 19th century. In this region, too, town meetings were instituted allowing yet another regionally unique form of democratic participation. Not surprisingly, schools were often the early venue for such town meetings.

The South

Prior to 1860 in the South, attention to education was primarily an individual concern and it wasn't until Northern reformers and philanthropists imposed education as a vehicle of reform after the Civil War that common schools were established there. "As uncharitable toward southern civilization as they had been toward southern slavery 'northern spokesmen' insisted that the ante-bellum South had produced neither education nor art nor literature nor science worthy of the name, and they proposed to make up these deficiencies by 'Americanizing' the defeated region."[13]

It took longer for common schools to become firmly established in the South. Nonetheless, by the end of the 19th century, elementary schooling had become almost universal and secondary schools were becoming more common especially in larger towns and cities. The burdens of a dual system of education that was firmly established by 1880, one system for African Americans, and one for Caucasians, however, limited the possibilities for many more decades. Equity and democracy writ large were hostages.

The Middle West

In the Middle West, participation by citizens (primarily farmers) in the decisions regarding the district schools exemplified, perhaps, the most tangible form of democracy.

> *...in all America there was, perhaps, no better symbol of the shared community life people remembered than the one-room schoolhouse standing in the center of an independent school district on the Middle Border. From first to last that schoolhouse represented a community enterprise. The people of the district had voted for its construction, picked the place where it would stand, and controlled its use when it was completed. At one stage or another of this process, they had, in most cases, even fought over it as families fight; yet it belonged to all the district's families, and because it was their own, most people in the community were interested in what took place there.*[14]

In the Middle West, grass-roots initiative was evident as citizens had a voice in the levying of taxes, maintaining the schoolhouse, and resolving conflicts about new school finances — who to hire to re-do the blackboard, and how much firewood was sufficient for a term of school. Decisions having financial implications often inspired debate as evidenced by this note about a Tecumseh Township School Board meeting in Michigan in 1889: "The amount of wood in the woodpile became a bone of contention. The farmers were so obviously suspicious of one another that they appointed a committee of two, presumably one for each side, to appraise the woodpile and report back to the annual meeting before a vote could be taken on the fuel issue."[15]

The community school provided the vehicle for direct democratic citizen involvement and voice — for there was no denying the investment most citizens had in their schools. "For many citizens discussing school matters was their only opportunity for political participation and they guarded it quite jealously."[16] Fundamental matters with health implications such as how to properly get water for each student during the course of the day were voted on as zealously as were teachers' salary issues. In Dane County, Wisconsin, in 1911, school board members "voted to have the children fill their cups with the dipper rather than dipping their cups in the water pail."[17]

Webster's Blue Black Speller—The Great Equalizer?

Rural communities, often considered the poor 'country cousins' to those in more cosmopolitan urban areas, were quite proud if one of their scholars could spell a word from the last pages of Webster's Blue Black Speller for this meant that their students, teachers, and schools were as competent and capable as their urban counterparts.

Noah Webster emphasized the importance of uniform elocution in enabling and proving the realization of the democratic vision. He proposed that Americans use language as a unifying feature rather than as a way to determine class, rank, or regional differences as was so prevalent in European society. Therefore, his speller encouraged learners to spell and pronounce words syllable by syllable. Webster marketed his speller as the great equalizer for "if all Americans could read, write, speak, and spell in the same way, it would demonstrate beyond doubt how equal in station they were."[18] Among frontier families who owned books, Webster's Blue-Black Speller was often second only to the Bible in popularity.

In 19th century schools, spelling competitions enabled students from small rural schools to demonstrate their learning and competence. For though rural schools were often forced to make due with fewer resources, they prided themselves on the quality of the education they fostered. This account from a county superintendent and inspector of rural schools in Boyd County, Wisconsin in 1903, addressed the lack of resources but firm commitment to education so apparent in rural communities :

> *The schoolhouse was so humble "we could look out through the roof and see the sun and sky. We could see out the door without opening it. Some of the window lights were out. There were holes in the floor which was laid almost on the earth — just two by two scantlings under it." Yet here in this unlikely place, fourteen students, some of them terribly poor, were being educated in a rigorous fashion. "There was no one staring at us, no laughing at us, no uncomplimentary remarks.*

Every pupil kept at his work. Classes were called and dismissed in good order."
The spelling class they witnessed was composed of five little girls and a boy named Dick,

> *"freckle-faced, shabbily dressed...who took his place at the head of the class. As he came to the recitation," the inspector continued, "he pushed one foot along over the rough floor. At first we thought he was lame. But a glance told the cause and we looked the other way. He was wearing an old shoe that would hardly hang on his foot.... Had he lifted his foot the old shoe sole would have flapped...as he walked.... But Dick held his place at the head of the class," and the inspector could see the "proud sparkle in his eyes, the bright gleam on his face, "when he heard the teacher announce: "Dick wins the head mark today."*[19]

The popularity of Webster's Speller throughout much of the 19th century speaks to its perceived power as a tool of democracy. Optimistically, Webster contended that, ultimately, his Speller would do away with differences in regional accents. While many people fondly remember their school spelling bees and may attribute their spelling ability to early exposure to Webster's Speller, Webster's claim to do away with regional accents met with much less success.

The Closing of the Frontier: Political & Educational Implications

In 1893, to the general alarm of the American public, the historian Frederick Jackson Turner announced that "with the closing of the frontier a crucial factor in maintaining American democracy and openness has gone."[20] The passing of the frontier suggested that the United States was full. With the realization that land was not unlimited, Americans became aware of the possible subsequent scarcity of natural resources. A more conservative attitude toward the allocation and utilization of natural resources developed. The attitude of people "inhabiting a land flowing with milk and honey and building a democratic society where no man had too much yet all had enough [and whose] life on the land had made them individualistic, independent, and resourceful...[whose] ownership of land had given them status and dignity, made them proud, even haughty perhaps, raised them to the equal of any man, and [which] strengthened their nationalism"[21] was changing. The earlier perception of having unlimited resources and boundless opportunity was now tempered with a caution which was mirrored in legislation, educational thought, and social attitude.

Liberal and Conservative Progressivists

It is difficult to generalize about the impact the closing of the frontier had on the two major political attitudes of the time. For the most part, the South and Middle West continued to encourage citizen participation in government — a view known as liberal progressivism. The farmers in these areas were distrustful of big business and the newly emerging class of 'experts' and believed that real power should reside in the grass-roots of home communities. Their faith in the ability of people to participate in the democratic process, to work for resolution of social issues, was unshaken.

These liberal progressivists were politically opposed by conservative progressivists

who were rooted primarily in the Eastern United States and in urban areas. Conservative progressivists felt that the most qualified people to solve conflict or induce progress were those who were scientifically trained expert managers. They believed that the ability of experts to make well-informed, scientific decisions divorced from popular opinion, emotional sentiment, and 'irrationality' should be instrumental in influencing government and legislation. Conservative progressivists supported the utilization of expert opinion for advising state legislators, governors and national political leaders thus, impacting legislation which ultimately effected all the people of the nation. From the turn of the century, the number of experts involved at various governmental levels grew astronomically. Legislators were now lending an attentive ear to fewer local constituents and were increasingly influenced by professional or expert opinion. This indicated a power shift from the voice of the many to the voice of a few. With the erosion of the local base of power and the citizen voice, "the U.S. was becoming what some have dubbed the 'expert society.'"[22]

Consolidation: For Whom the Bell Tolls

The closing of small schools has resulted in the loss of voice for many people in small rural communities. These people, who were intimately invested in the outcomes of their local schools and who had historically been empowered by the engagement of participatory democracy were now being told, by outsiders, what to do. Experts, far removed from local rural communities, assumed authority and offered advice to rural citizens. Ill-fitting expert advice or mandates resulted. One Boston architect, in 1880, drew plans for rural schools which included decorated cornices, spires, and extravagant ventilating systems. He also included plans for a gardener to take care of the grounds. "But nearly all such plans, although beautifully drawn and expertly explained, were so out of touch with the plain life of the Midwestern farmers and so far beyond their means that they were ignored."[23]

Despite apparent irrelevancies and the obvious lack of a local knowledge of place, opinions of outsiders continued to drive the consolidation process. Eventually communities acquiesced to the persistent voice of experts who declared that they knew what was best for the good of any rural area, experts who claimed to have the generic answer, the one-size-fits-all approach to education. As Robert Coles explains in Education in Rural America, "A people possessed of its own intelligence and sensibility [were] given credit for neither"[24] and authority was assumed by outsiders.

Legislation has effectively undermined the ability of community citizens to make decisions at the local level. In essence, the voice of those 'closest to home,' those with the deepest knowledge of place and local community, have been effectively silenced by a society which deems a deeper reverence for the 'knowledge' of the expert.

Control and power eventually came to reside in the hands of distant legislatures and experts, the professionals, who:

> *like some of the founding fathers at the Constitutional Convention in 1787...believed that the nation's troubles sprang from an "excess of democracy"... professional educators thought that independent school districts which allowed*

direct democratic participation were far too democratic to produce good schools...Burke Hinsdale (the primary organizer of the Committee of Twelve's study and report on rural schools in 1896)...pointed out that the democratic theory upon which the district system was based had been replaced by the representative system everywhere in the nation except in education. "The district system is very dear to the hearts of very many people. But anyone who will inquire into the facts can hardly avoid...the conclusion that... it is an absurdity.[25]

The Impact of Legislation

Participatory democracy mandated that citizens learn to wrestle with tough choices — to make decisions for the good of the whole community. Acknowledging the value of such discourse, the county superintendent of Fond Du Lac County, Wisconsin, in the late 1800's stated:

I know of scarcely any instance in which a smart district quarrel had not been followed by a better state of things in the district; and, although for the time being they may not have been deemed altogether joyous, yet experience teaches that it is often times only through great tribulations that communities as well as individuals are to be lifted to a higher plain of civilization.[26]

The impact of state legislation which attempted to regulate rural schools in sites far removed from each specific locale stifled local voice and civic participation, effectively disenfranchising a populace which had, at one time, so spiritedly engaged in local government, education and community.

Today, rural schools and their accompanying educational concerns which historically provoked and responded to local representative voice may seem as illusory a concept as the dream of equality under which public schools were originally conceived. Centralization of power, the overwhelming bureaucratization of schools, the increasing utilization of representative -- as opposed to direct -- democracy, and the frequency of local deference to the perceived wisdom of outside experts (or professionals with particular credentials) has worked to undermine the resilient spirit of the citizens of rural schools and rural communities.

Over the years, state and national governments, rife with a host of experts, have wrested voice and power away from local citizens, coercing rural conformity to more urbanized, industrial models of education. The imposition of centralized governance and generic standards has not been salutary for rural schools and communities.

As legislation for consolidation threatens or closes the doors of our last small rural schools, we may be effectively discouraging local activism, inhibiting an altruistic concern for the good of the commonwealth, and disempowering local community voice. As decisions are made farther and farther from home, we discredit the value of local knowledge. Some may wonder, with the final tolling of the school house bell, has the purest form of democracy — that of direct participation — been silenced forever?

Consolidation first began as early as 1869 in New England, but did not impact the Middle West until the last decade of the 19th century when it spread like wild-fire as schoolhouse after schoolhouse was shut down, auctioned off, or abandoned. The most

damaging of the consolidations came in the period after the second World War as "expert" opinion pushed for ever larger secondary schools. The rural landscape is now filled with these newer consolidated schools that stand in fields far away from town centers or settled communities, that lack a significant history and identity.

More Direct Involvement By Local Citizens

We have come full circle. Unhappy with the bureaucratic centralization consolidated schools exemplify, citizens are making efforts to exert more local control. As people at the local level once again become confident in their own knowledge, they are more effectively exerting influence as to what and how their children learn. Group efforts of concerned citizens, working within a democracy, are working to carve out and define community.

Responding to a need for a sense of belonging to a community, an investment in a place and the people of that place, and acting as agents of local voice, the current charter school movement — exemplifies just one of several attempts of local citizens to participate in their local schools, be they urban, suburban or rural. Concerned citizens are becoming more able to set up autonomous schools as they learn to work more effectively with existing school systems to guarantee sensitivity to local constituencies.[27] Ray Budde, author of Education by Charter: Restructuring School Districts, acknowledges the value of public investment: "We value what is ours, what belongs to us. Working together with other people in common purpose produces truly amazing results."[28] Beyond charters, smaller consolidated schools are resisting larger consolidation, arguing that they can participate in the revitalization of their communities while offering a superior education. They argue for the virtues of communities and schools needing to be linked, tied to democratic purposes. Educational activist, Tony Wagner asserts in this regard that: "It is increasingly clear as well that significant improvements in learning for all students require closer collaboration between schools and families. People working together in smaller schools can build strong relationships and come to agreement more readily on their unifying mission and core values..."[29]

Public Sentiment: Democracy and Schools

A recent Phi Delta Kappan/Gallup Poll reflected public sentiment regarding goals for the nation's public schools. The most important goal of public schools, according to respondents, was "to prepare students to be responsible citizens"[30]— an echo of the democratic function of schools as they were originally conceived. The mission of many of the old country schools was to teach students: "the three R's...spelling, history, geography, physiology, and civil government, cultivate in them a love of country, beauty, and truth, improve their manners, and above all raise their moral standards to make them citizens worthy of their great nation."[31] Many people in rural communities want to maintain that legacy.

Helping people to become economically self-sufficient was the goal mentioned second most frequently by Gallup Poll respondents. Historically, as rural communities

lost their core with the consolidation of their schools, their economic viability also dwindled. With reduced economic viability, employment-seeking youth went elsewhere. As large numbers of people leave a community, the loss, along with the diminished perception of the desirability of the community as a place to live results in a loss of community and communal identity. With no defining community characteristics, the desire to work to save a community withers away as well.

Today, as we re-acknowledge the value of civic responsibility and begin to re-assert local voice in decision-making, there arises a consequent renewed sense of individual responsibility toward public work within the community. A recent Gallup Poll reflected an increasing commitment to public service within community: 66% of respondents favored community service as a requirement for graduation from high school.

Educator John Dewey perhaps expressed best the valuable interchange between school, community, and democracy years ago:

> *What the best and wisest parent wants for his own child, that must the community want for all of its children. Any other ideal for our schools is narrow and unlovely; acted upon, it destroys our democracy. All that society has accomplished for itself is put, through the agency of the school, at the disposal of its future members. All its better thoughts of itself it hopes to realize through the new possibilities thus opened to its future self. Here individualism and socialism are as one. Only by being true to the full growth of all the individuals who make it up, can society by any chance be true to itself.*[32]

Gallup poll respondents felt that local teachers were most committed to the goal of local public school improvement while the leaders who were farther removed from local schools were perceived as less committed. This speaks to the local control which community members historically exerted in small rural schools. Then, as now, citizens recognize that those within the community are the ones most aware of local concerns, communal needs, and the unique value of place and are, consequently, the ones who should make decisions regarding the education of children within their district or locale. Gallup Poll respondents' perceptions of commitment from most to least was: teachers, school board members, superintendents, governors and state legislators.

People in small communities are able to make informed political decisions as they vote for those they know will represent them well locally...

> *Unlike urban school elections in which the school board candidates were largely unknown to the average voter, the farmers knew the people they voted for extremely well. They saw them in their daily life, visited with them after church, watched them farm, heard them speak at Grange...and had a reasonably good idea of who the most capable among them were...*[333]

The confidence that comes from knowing those who represent you and make decisions about the education of those within your community supersedes the authority of 'experts.'

As children see their parents and other invested citizens actively engaged in the community, they are witnessing role-models for their own democratic participation and

empowerment in their community. A survey of successful Indiana professionals indicated that they attributed their success to "their schooling and ...their rural environment. One factor, in particular, to which they all paid tribute was the interest their parents took in their education."[34] Parents and concerned citizens take an interest and participate in their local community when their voice has value — when they are recognized as 'experts' in their own right. We are currently witnessing increasing examples of community people asserting their voices on behalf of democratic processes (see Michael W. Apple and James A. Beane, *Democratic Schools*).

Consolidation of schools occurred despite the warning issued, in 1939, by the American Association of School Administrators in Schools in Small Communities:

> *keep the schools and the government of the schools close to the people, so that the citizens generally, including the parents and taxpayers, may know what their schools are doing, and may have an effective voice in the school program. The relationship of the schools to the natural community and the closeness of the school to the people are of first-rate educational significance and are not to be sacrificed in the interest of 'efficiency.' If such a sacrifice is made to establish economical districts, we will find in a generation that something of deep significance which money cannot buy has been destroyed.*[35]

It is possible that local schools and rural communities will thrive once again as concerned citizens exert more influence in the democratic process to determine the survival of small schools and the viability of rural communities. Through direct involvement in local institutions such as community schools, we may resurrect community identity which was so closely tied to the local school. In rural (and urban) areas, there are people who are once again participating in grass-roots democracy. It is the commit ment of these empowered citizens that helps shape local policy to reflect that which is "best and wisest" for its children. The Rural Challenge is, in effect, an attempt to reaffirm these democratic principles and the value of local place.

Notes

[1]Wayne E. Fuller, *The Old Country School* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982), p. 235
[2]Ibid., p. 113.
[3]Ibid., p. 109.
[4]Robert L. Church & Michael W. Sedlak, *Education in the United States: An Interpretive History* (New York: The Free Press/Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1976), p. 11.
[5]Wayne E. Fuller, *The Old Country School*, p. 74.
[6] Such a history doesn't always bring to everyone fond memories. It is, however, a good example of our often expressed phrase — "democracy is very messy."
[7]Wayne E. Fuller, *The Old Country School*, p. 45.
[8]Robert L. Church & Michael W. Sedlak, *Education in the United States: An Interpretive History*, p. 6.
[9]Ibid., p. 28.
[10]Rush Welter, *Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America* (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1962), p. 24.
[11]Robert L. Church & Michael W. Sedlak, *Education in the United States: An Interpretive History*, p. 7.
[12]Hicks, John D., "Our Own Middle West 1900-1940," in Nichols, Jeannette P. & Randall, J. G. (eds.), *Democracy in the Middle West ,1840-1940* (New York: D. Appleton-Century, Inc.), p. 98.
[13]Ibid., p. 142.
[14]Wayne E. Fuller, *The Old Country School*, p. 60.
[15]Ibid., p. 52.
[16]Robert L. Church & Michael W. Sedlak, *Education in the United States: An Interpretive History*, p. 10.
[17]Wayne E. Fuller, *The Old Country School*, p. 58.
[18]Robert L. Church & Michael W. Sedlak, *Education in the United States: An Interpretive History*, p. 17.
[19]Wayne E. Fuller, *The Old Country School*, p. 190-191.
[20]Robert L. Church & Michael W. Sedlak, *Education in the United States: An Interpretive History*, p. 254.
[21]Wayne E. Fuller, *The Old Country School*, p. 35-36.
[22]Robert L. Church & Michael W. Sedlak, *Education in the United States: An Interpretive History*, p. 349.
[23]Wayne E. Fuller, *The Old Country School*, p. 69.
[24]Andrew Gulliford, *America's Country Schools* (Washington D.C.: The Preservation Press, 1991) p. 45.
[25]Wayne E. Fuller, *The Old Country School*, p. 107.
[26]Ibid., p. 110.
[27]While we worry about the effects of charter schools as public policy, some of the impetus at various local levels for creating charter schools is clearly understandable.
[28]Ray Budde, *Phi Delta Kappan*, Sept. 1996, Volume 78, Number 1. p. 72.
[29]Tony Wagner, "School Choice to What End?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, Sept. 1996, Volume 78, Number 1, p. 71.
[30]*Phi Delta Kappan*, September 1996, Volume 78, Number 1. p. 55.
[31]Wayne E. Fuller, *The Old Country School*. p. 189.
[32]Robert L. Church & Michael W. Sedlak, *Education in the United States: An Interpretive History*, p. 261.
[33]Wayne E. Fuller, *The Old Country School*, p. 83.
[34]Ibid., p. 3.
[35]Andrew Gulliford, *America's Country Schools*, p. 44.